

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
TYLER DIVISION**

RICHARD BLANE SIMS,	§	
	§	
Plaintiff,	§	
	§	
v.	§	Case No. 6:23-cv-299-JDK-KNM
	§	
LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS	§	
IN MABANK, TEXAS	§	
	§	
Defendants.	§	

**ORDER ADOPTING THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

Plaintiff Richard Blane Sims, an inmate of the Henderson County Jail proceeding pro se, filed this civil rights lawsuit pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 without paying the filing fee. The case was referred to United States Magistrate K. Nicole Mitchell for findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommendations for the disposition of the case.

On August 17, 2023, Judge Mitchell issued a Report recommending that Plaintiff's lawsuit be dismissed for failure to prosecute because Plaintiff had failed to comply with the Court's order to satisfy the filing fee requirement and amend his complaint. Docket No. 3. A copy of this Report was mailed to Plaintiff, but he did not file written objections and has taken no steps to prosecute this case since he filed his complaint.

This Court reviews the findings and conclusions of the Magistrate Judge de novo only if a party objects within fourteen days of the Report and Recommendation.


28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In conducting a de novo review, the Court examines the entire record and makes an independent assessment under the law. *Douglass v. United Servs. Auto. Ass’n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1430 (5th Cir. 1996) (en banc), *superseded on other grounds by statute*, 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (extending the time to file objections from ten to fourteen days).

Here, Plaintiff did not object in the prescribed period. The Court therefore reviews the Magistrate Judge’s findings for clear error or abuse of discretion and reviews his legal conclusions to determine whether they are contrary to law. *See United States v. Wilson*, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir. 1989), *cert. denied*, 492 U.S. 918 (1989) (holding that, if no objections to a Magistrate Judge’s Report are filed, the standard of review is “clearly erroneous, abuse of discretion and contrary to law.”).

Having reviewed the Magistrate Judge’s Report and the record in this case, the Court finds no clear error or abuse of discretion and no conclusions contrary to law. Accordingly, the Court hereby **ADOPTS** the Report and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge (Docket No. 3) as the findings of this Court. It is therefore **ORDERED** that this case is **DISMISSED** without prejudice for failure to prosecute. All pending motions are **DENIED** as **MOOT**.

Signed this

Oct 4, 2023


JEREMY D. KERNODLE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE